

REMARKS

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Office Action dated June 20, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

Summary of Rejections

Claims 1-35 were pending at the time of the Office Action.

Claims 1-35 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suaez (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,789).

Summary of Response

No claims were amended.

Claims 1-35 remain as originally submitted.

Remarks and Arguments are provided below.

Summary of Claims Pending

Claims 1-35 are currently pending following this response.

Response to Rejections under Section 103

In the Office Action dated June 20 2006, Claims 1-35 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suarez (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,789).

The instant disclosure is directed to a client-server-type three-tier network. In particular, front-office applications are provided access to back-office systems through an enterprise integration layer (middleware). In the instant disclosure the enterprise integration layer comprises client access interfaces for communicating with the front-office applications, a business object server to manipulate business objects, and a set of adapters to transform business objects into requests in the back-office systems. Also, in the instant disclosure is a messaging system coupled to the enterprise integration layer that automatically makes computing applications aware of business events.

Suarez discloses a peer-to-peer-type network that uses intelligent agents to direct messages to/from services. This network architecture allows for services to cooperatively perform tasks through messaging controlled by the intelligent agents. Suarez further discloses a list of reasons for why not to use a client-server-type network architecture on column 2, line 36 – column 4, line 35.

I. Suarez does not disclose a set of client access interfaces coupled to front-office applications that transform data from a format of the front-office to a common data format.

The Office Action relied on column 9, lines 14-39 of Suarez to teach these limitations. In the cited section of Suarez a description of agents and their functionality is described. In particular, agents are described to “provide both interconnectivity and services on behalf of a user or another agent” wherein, “the agent assumes a dynamic behavior tailored to the service it provides, the process flows incorporated within the

computing environment, the physical attributes of the computing environment into which it is incorporated, and specific tasks to be accomplished".

It is being assumed that this disclosure of agents providing interconnectivity is being read on the limitation of a set of client access interfaces. While the agents are disclosed to provide interconnectivity (an interface) on behalf of a user or another agent (a client) to services, there is no disclosure of the agents coupled to front-office applications. In particular, due to the distributed peer-to-peer architecture of Suarez shown in Fig. 1, there is no "front-office" or front-end.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure of the agents transforming data from a format of the front-office to a common data format. It is noted that while Suarez does disclose that "agents represent a standard architecture which facilitates cooperation and collaboration between agents", this is not disclosure of transforming data formats. In particular, the agents representing a "standard architecture" is not disclosure of transforming data into a common data format.

II. Suarez does not disclose a business object server coupled to the client access interfaces that performs object management.

The Office Action relied on column 11, line 60 – column 12, line 11 to teach these limitations. Disclosed in the cited section is a discussion of a "Point of Control" for allowing a designer to take control of a process at a particular point in time. Note that the message management, transaction behavior, security, and execution is disclosed to be controlled by a designer. Also note that there is no disclosure of performing object management in the section cited. Note paragraphs 48-50 of the

instant disclosure for a discussion of business objects. Further, Suarez does not provide any disclosure of a server, since Suarez's network architecture is a peer-to-peer-type network. The only discussion of servers in Suarez is in the background where Suarez discloses the disadvantages of a client-server network architecture.

III. Suarez does not disclose a set of adapters coupled to the business object server that transform business objects into requests compatible with a back-office system.

The Office Action relied on column 9, lines 14-39 to teach these limitations. Disclosed in the cited section is the process through which agents communicate with each other through buss agents and various message manipulations. There is no disclosure that these manipulations are used to transform the messages into requests compatible with a back-office system. Also, while Suarez does disclose message manipulation there is no disclosure of transforming business objects. The instant disclosure clearly distinguishes between messages (note paragraph 41 of the instant disclosure) and business objects (note paragraph 48-50 of the instant disclosure). Further, due to the distributed peer-to-peer architecture of Suarez shown in Fig. 1, there is no disclosure of "back-office" or back-end systems.

Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 each contain limitations similar to those described above. As such, Suarez does not disclose the claimed limitations of claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 for at least the reasons detailed in I-III above.

Claims 2-9, 12-20, 21-30, and 32-35 depend from claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 respectively. As such, Suarez does not disclose the limitations recited in each of these claims for at least the reasons detailed in I-III above.

Conclusion

Suarez does not disclose a client-server architecture and as such cannot be used to reject the client-server architecture as claimed.


Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 21-0765, Sprint.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

9/11/2006
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 731-2288
(972) 731-2289 (facsimile)



Michael W. Piper
Reg. No. 39,800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT